

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Applicants add new claims 8 and 9. Therefore, by this Amendment, claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 have been examined. The Examiner objects to claims 2-7 but does not reject these claims under any art of record. Consequently, only claim 1 is currently rejected. Specifically, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Crump et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,320,874 (hereinafter "Crump"). By way of overview, Applicants traverse the rejection of claim 1 for at least the exemplary reasons set forth below.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

As noted above, claims 2-7 are not rejected under any art of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the allowability of these claims.

III. Claim 1 Is Not Anticipated By Crump

Claim 1 stands rejected under § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Crump. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the translating apparatus 110 of Crump corresponds to the "second device" recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that the first device (*i.e.*, X.25 device) 102 and the second device (*i.e.*, TCP device) 118 of Crump corresponds to the "first device" and "another device" recited in claim 1. Further still, the Examiner's position is that the "TCP FIN message" of Crump corresponds to the "connection release request command"

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

recited in claim 1, causing the second device to break the point-to-point connection between the first device and the another device (*see* Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, claim 1 is directed to a method for managing the connection of a plurality of devices which are point-to-point connected by a digital interface. Crump does not relate to managing the connection of devices that are connected (in a point-to-point manner) via a digital interface. To the contrary, as noted above, Crump relates to facilitating the communication of devices using different communication protocols (and communicating over different communication protocol networks) by including an intermediary translating apparatus (*see* Crump: Fig. 1).

Furthermore, claim 1 recites "a second device, which establishes a point-to-point connection between an arbitrary first device and another device". Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, the translating apparatus 110 of Crump does not correspond to the recited second device. For example, the translating apparatus 110 does not establish a point-to-point connection between an arbitrary first device and another device.

To the contrary, in Crump, a first device 102 communicates with the translating apparatus 110 over a first communication protocol network 106 using a first communication protocol, and a second device 118 communicates with the translating apparatus 110 over a second communication protocol network 114 using a second communication protocol (*see* Crump: col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 13). Thus, a point-to-point connection is not established between the first device 102 and the second device 118 by the translating apparatus 110. Instead, the translating apparatus 110 provides a first network interface 202, which includes logic that

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

enables the translating apparatus 110 to communicate with the first device 102 over the first communication protocol network 106, and a second network interface 206, which includes logic that enables the translating apparatus 110 to communicate with the second device 118 over the second communication protocol network 114 (*see* Crump: col. 4, lines 4-38). The translating apparatus 110 also includes control logic 204 that performs a translation function for converting between first communication protocol messages received from the first device 102 and second communication protocol messages received from the second device 118 (*see* Crump: col. 4, lines 39-48).

Thus, although the translating apparatus 110 is connected to the first device 102 via links 104 and 108, as well as the first communication protocol network 106, and the translating apparatus 110 is connected to the second device 118 via links 112 and 116, as well as the second communication protocol network 114, no point-to-point connection is established between the first device and the second device by the translating apparatus, as required by claim 1.

For at least the above exemplary reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Crump.

IV. New Claims 8 and 9

Applicants add new claims 8 and 9 in order to obtain an expanded scope of protection. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9 are each patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

V. Formal Matters

Priority

The Examiner acknowledges Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, including receipt of the priority document.

Cited References

The Examiner provides a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with Applicants' IDS filed on April 29, 2003, thereby indicating consideration of the references cited therein. However, the Examiner has not yet provided a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with Applicants' IDS filed on September 23, 2003. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a signed and initialed copy of this form in the next correspondence.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/626,080
Attorney Docket No. Q59998

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Billy Carter Raulerson

Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 18, 2003